

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,994	01/22/2002	Jim Hunter	8229-018-27 CIP	2175
7590 01/12/2005			EXAMINER	
Supervisor, Patent Prosecution Services			AMARI, ALESSANDRO V	
PIPER MARBURY RUDNICK & WOLFE LLP 1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Washington, DC 20036-2412		2872		

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·		}(·	A	
,	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Advisory Action	10/050,994	HUNTER ET AL		
_	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Alessandro V. Amari	2872		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence address		
THE REPLY FILED 28 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a		
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire le ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amon he shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate exten unt of the fee. The appropriate exter originally set in the final Office action	nsion nsion n; or	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>28 December 2004</u> . 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:			
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);		
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying t	the	
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	ion(s):			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendme	ent	
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the	е	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10</u> .				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·		
10. Other:		1.		

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claims as finally rejected do not distinguish the claimed reflective light processing element from the prior art cited. Firstly, the withdrawal of the Godil rejection has no bearing on whether the applicants have established a conception and reduction to practice and the Examiner has not concluded as such. The issue in the previous office action was directed to the affidavits, which attempted to swear behind the Hawkins et al reference. If the applicants are ultimately successful in overcoming the filing date of the Hawkins reference, then the Godil reference would be applied. Secondly, the Examiner at the time of the final rejection, had considered all the evidence in its entirety, including the declaration and exhibits. The Examiner reviewed the declaration and attempted to correlate the statements in the declaration with exhibits and found that they were not supported. The Examiner explicitly mentioned several features as not being shown in the exhibits despite the statements in the declaration. Finally, the applicants in the current after final amendment still have not provided facts sufficient to show reduction to practice prior to the effective date of the Hawkins reference, namely test results. Therefore, the Examiner's statements in the final rejection that the evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention and reduction to practice prior to the effective date of the Hawkins reference stands.